

Julie & Phil Hopes
The Poynings
Middle Way
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 1SB

Your Ref: OWPC23746
Our Ref: K/19/19/HH 25-06-2019
Please ask for:
Zac Denton

24th July 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Two storey rear extension with a small canopy projecting the footprint to the front.
Demolition of existing living room and additional first floor for habitable use with alterations to fenestration.

Little Tangle Middle Way Kingston Gorse East Preston

Thank you for your internet representation made on 23rd July 2019 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

We have a number of objections to the current application specifically:

- *Impact on privacy and daylight; and*
- *Over-development of the site due to the change in mass and height.*

The application is described as an extension to a detached house and one that does not materially alter the footprint. This description is somewhat misleading:

1. Little Tangle is a bungalow, with a room in a small part of the roof rather than a detached house. The application maintains the overall m2 on the ground floor but it increases the overall building mass by over 200% due to the 1st floor changes.

2. The building ridge height is currently c12m and the proposed ridge height is c15.4m, an increase of 3.4m (a 28% increase). Our ridge height is 13.4m.

It is unclear how such a significant increase in the ridge height can be considered as an extension. The 2018 planning application for The Poynings required our small side extension (which did not overlook the neighbouring property) be subservient to the existing building. This required the extension ridge height to be reduced to 50cm below the existing. This resulted in a material compromise in the upstairs extension creating a very low skilling 50cm lower than was anticipated.

If the planning rules are applied consistently the maximum ridge height for this extension, should be c11.5m.

3. The ground floor m2 footprint is unchanged but the shape of the footprint is different. The proposed rear development extends the footprint beyond the current building line and that of The Poynings. It would be a 2-storey extension 3.4m higher than it is today and 2m higher than The Poynings.

We believe the rear balcony gable would extend at least 1.5m beyond the line of The Poynings.

Objections: The change in mass and height represents over development of the site and feels beyond what can be considered an extension.

The change in the scale of building will directly impact the daylight to the rear patio of The Poynings, where the main garden seating is located. It will also impact on our privacy as it will increase overlooking of the rear garden. We also think it will block light to our lounge by causing shadowing to the patio doors.

The front development will overlook our front seating area. We note the material impact the front upper storey "small canopy" (a misleading description) will have on Clova. This will extend across their side kitchen window and directly block their light.

4. There is to be a window on the ground floor east elevation. One exists today but it is small, opaque and virtually invisible due to the height of the side fencing. It is unclear from the drawings if this is to be maintained or changed in anyway i.e. size, glass type etc. We are assuming any planning approval would require the current level of privacy to be maintained.

5. We note that there is to be no change to hedging given there is a substantial hedge on the east boundary that screens Little Tangle from The Poynings. The comments in the Design and Access statement are somewhat contradictory as they state there will be no changes to hedging and fencing and then go on to say that there will be. We would welcome clarification of what is intended.

In conclusion we have material objections to the development and are very disappointed that the Design and Access Statement has been quite so optimistic in its description of the changes and their impact on both The Poynings and Clova. We would welcome the Arun Council Planning Officer undertaking a site visit to see first hand the level of change that is being proposed as an extension.

Unfortunately it is not possible for the council to respond to each representation individually but your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

If the application is to be determined at the Development Control Committee and your letter has been received after the agenda has been published, you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and the procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances, it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the website or telephone for further information. Please be advised that any comments received after the the Development Control Agenda has been produced will be reported to the meeting. Please also note that only a small number of all planning applications are determined at the Development Control Committee, most are determined by officers under delegated power.

All representations are published on our website so please make sure your views are clear and only include information that you are happy for the public to view. Do not include personal information or information from third parties unless you have their permission to do so. If a complaint is received that permission has not been given for comments included about a third party, the Council reserves the right to redact/remove all relevant information. Do not include information that is defamatory or breaches equality or other legislation. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the website and on the file, please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed, although this does mean that its contents will be disregarded. For details of what we do with your personal information please refer to our privacy statement comments on planning applications which is available on our website www.arun.gov.uk/planning-privacy-statements.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning